functions were to recruit, provide intelligence and material support for the rebel forces in the field; and to kill, terrorize or drive out government officials, clergy, merchants and landowners who remained loyal to the established government. Who can say what the outcome would have been had the British been ruthless and imaginative enough to strike at the roots of the rebellion by systematically destroying the rebel infrastructure and logistics base, burning crops, blowing up hard-core villages, regrouping the peasants in British-controlled territory, and applying other forceful pacification measures to win over the hearts and minds of the colonists?

The failure to understand the techniques of insurgency was, however, only one factor in the British defeat. Another was the support provided the rebels by France and, to a limited degree, by Spain – at first logistic support, later direct military forces. This support from two bulwarks of conservatism in Europe was indeed ironic. A decade later France was one of the leading dominoes to fall as a result of the failure of the British counterinsurgency effort. Soon afterward Spain also went, though fortunately the British were able subsequently to restore responsible pragmatic government to that country. DAVID FELIX

Dow at Harvard

The Right to Recruit On College Campuses

by Maurice Ford

Dow Chemical has many diversified interests, but students are concerned with only 5 percent of its business. Dow is the principal supplier to the United States military of napalm – a jelly-like substance that defoliates human beings as well as trees. Seventy students were injured by riot-trained police and 13 expelled at the University of Wisconsin when they locked arms to prevent interviews with Dow. A sleep-in was staged against Dow on the carpeted floor of the plush Regents Room of the University of Minnesota. Students at the University of Illinois kept a Dow recruiter isolated in a room for five hours. On October 25, it was Harvard's turn when Dr. Frederick Leavitt, Dow's interviewer, was imprisoned for seven hours by 300 Harvard and Radcliffe students jamming the corridors of Mallinckrodt Chemical Laboratories, while others picketed outside with signs reading "Dow Shalt Not Kill" and "Napalm – Johnson's Baby Powder." The Dean of Harvard College, Fred Glimp, urged the obstructors to leave, intimating they might be guilty of kidnaping, until a more legally astute demonstrator pointed out an essential element of that crime was "secreting a person in a place where no one knew where to find him," which caused all to break out in laughter.

This was a good-humored, responsible crowd, not the often violent mob which had confronted Secretary of Defense McNamara a year ago. Harvard deans and faculty members (among them Louis Fieser, the inventor of napalm) were allowed to go to and from the interview room at will. Dow's Dr. Leavitt was encouraged to address the crowd, and he explained that the aspect of the business for which he sought recruits had nothing to do with napalm, but the students were unwilling to accept this nice distinction. For them, Dow Chemical – and Harvard for inviting Dow – were co-partners with the Johnson Administration in genocide. They refused to permit Dr. Leavitt to leave until he had signed a statement commiting Dow never to darken Harvard's doors again.

Is recruiting but one branch of freedom of speech, or an activity essentially more invidious? The leaders of the Harvard protest had no objection to Dow hiring a university lecture hall and expounding on the efficacy of napalm as a means of concluding the war – as it has done uncritically in a recent press release: "The United States is involved in Vietnam. As long as we are involved, we believe in fulfilling our responsibility to this national commitment of a democratic society. And we do this because we believe in the long-term goals of our country." But recruiting was something different. Dow Chemical had chosen to profit from one of the more hideous aspects of the war and was inducing students, for a share of that financial gain, to sell a very meaningful part of themselves.

Neil Rudenstine, a popular assistant professor of English, recalled that, not so many years ago when he had been a senior at Princeton, considerable McCarthyite opposition had been expressed to the appearance of Alger Hiss. Yet at the insistence of a number of students probably not much larger than those seeking interviews with Dow, Hiss had been permitted to speak. Did today's liberals wish to adopt the repressive techniques of yesteryear? Rudenstine then considered the role of the university in the mod-

---

MR. FORD *is a teaching fellow at Harvard and assistant senior tutor of Dunsten House.*